UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

HALO ELECTRONICS, INC.,

) 2:07-CV-00331-PMP-PAL

Plaintiff.

ORDER

vs.)
BEL FUSE, INC., PULSE)
ENGINEERING, INC., and)

TECHNITROL, INC.,

Defendants.

Before the Court for consideration is Defendant Bel Fuse, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Halo Electronics' First Amended Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (Doc. #54), filed August 13, 2007. On November 30, 2007, the Court conducted a hearing regarding Bel Fuse's fully briefed motion.

Plaintiff Halo's first amended complaint asserts a claim for patent infringement against Defendant Bel Fuse and Co-defendants' Pulse Engineering and Technitrol. Bel Fuse contends that notwithstanding the opportunity to conduct jurisdictional discovery, Halo's amended complaint fails to allege facts sufficient to support personal jurisdiction over Bel Fuse in the State of Nevada. Halo responds that Bel Fuse maintains continuous and systematic contacts with Nevada which make it subject to general personal jurisdiction in this Court. Halo further argues that this Court has specific jurisdiction over Bel Fuse because Bel Fuse has purposefully directed its

activities at Nevada customers, Halo's infringement claim relates to Bel Fuse's Nevada activities, and the exercise of jurisdiction over Bel Fuse is reasonable and fair considering all of Bel Fuse contacts with Nevada.

In assessing Bel Fuse's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, this Court applies the legal standard articulated in <u>Huffy Corp. v. Overlord Indus.</u>, 246 F. Supp. 2d 1093, 1095-1096 (D. Nev. 2003). Under the foregoing standard, the Court finds that Halo has failed to meet its burden of demonstrating that general personal jurisdiction exist over Bel Fuse in Nevada or that Halo's infringement claim arises out of or relates to Bel Fuse's activities in Nevada so as to confer specific personal jurisdiction.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant Bel Fuse, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Halo Electronics' First Amended Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (Doc. #54) is GRANTED, and that Plaintiff's first amended complaint against Defendant Bel Fuse, Inc., is hereby DISMISSED.

DATED: December 5, 2007.

PHILIP M. PRO

United States District Judge